Generating Enhanced and Robust bipartite Optomechanical Entanglement via an auxiliary qubit induced quadratic mechanical nonlinearity

Subhadeep Chakraborty and Amarendra K. Sarma*
Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, Guwahati-781039, Assam, India
(Dated: June 22, 2016)

We present a scheme for obtaining steady-state optomechanical entanglement in an optomechanical system, in which the mechanical mirror is perturabatively coupled to an auxiliary qubit. The coupling between the mechanical oscillator and the single qubit results in a quadratic mechanical nonlinear term in the Hamiltonian describing the system. We find that the mechanical nonlinearity not only enhances the degree of optomechanical entanglement but also generate it at a considerably lower optomechanical coupling strength. We observe that the degree of entanglement decreases monotonically with increasing temperature. However, the maximum temperature up to which entanglement persists increase with increasing nonlinear amplitude. Thus, the bipartite entanglement in presence of the mechanical nonlinearity becomes more robust against thermal phonon fluctuations.

arXiv:1606.06419v1 [quant-ph] 21 Jun 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Observing the fundamental quantum behaviour of a macroscopic object has been a long sought-after goal in quantum physics. This is because, it not only leads to a deeper understanding to the quantum states residing at the border between classical and quantum world but also allows to apply cutting-edge quantum technologies to macroscale devices. In this regard, owing to the recent advances of microfabrication and nanotechnology, cavity optomechanics has preponderantly emerged as a versatile platform to realize the quantum regime of a macroscopic oscillator. Substantial progress has been made in this context, both in theory and experiment. Current researches in this area mainly include cavity cooling of a mechanical oscillator [1-6], continuous-variable entangled state preparation [7-13], quantum squeezing of a mechanical mode [14-19], nonclassical state generation [20-24] and quantum state transfer [25-29] etc. Along with the above mentioned studies, it has also become a key tool for wide range of potential applications, such as: quantum information processing [30-32], ultra-high precision measurements [33-35], gravitational wave detection [36,37], and even biological measurements [38]. Overall, preparation and manipulation of quantum states of a mechanical oscillator is now intensively pursued for different fundamental and technological aspects of cavity optomechanics.

A typical cavity optomechanical system consists of a laser driven optical cavity with a moveable end mirror. So far, in most of the studies , the mechanical mirror is treated as a pure quantum harmonic oscillator. However, regarding the quantumness of the mechanical mirror, it should be noted that a pure quantum harmonic motion is dynamically analogous to its classical counterpart, as, the expectation values of the canonical observables obey the same set of classical equation of motion [39]. Therefore, to fully explore the quantum nature of the mechanical mirror, it may be useful to introduce additional nonlinearity in the system. Here, it is worth mentioning that the intrinsic nonlinearity of a sub-gigahertz mechanical oscillator is usually very small (nonlinear amplitude smaller than $10^{-15}\omega_m$ [40]) and therefore only relevant in the regime of large oscillation amplitudes. Several studies have been reported to generate nonlinearities that are strong in the quantum regime [41-45]. In particular, recently, Rips *et al.* [46] have proposed a scheme to enhance the intrinsic geometrical nonlinearity via an inhomogeneous electrostatic field, which has been further exploited by Djorwé *et al.* [47] to generate robust optomechanical entanglement. In 2009 Jacobs *et al.* [48] proposed a scheme to engineer a wide range of nonlinearities by coupling it to a simple auxiliary system. Following [48], Lü *et al.* [49] engineered a Duffing nonlinearity to study mechanical squeezing in optomechanical system and Wang *et al.* [50] constructed a cubic nonlinearity to investigate steady state mechanical squeezing in a hybrid atom-optomechanical system. Jacobs. *et al.* [51] showed that it is possible to engineer superposition states simple by coupling a qubit to the square of the position of the nanomechanical resonator. Motivated by these works, we consider an optomechanical system in which the mechanical mirror is coupled to an auxiliary single qubit. Following [48], we find that this results in a quadratic nonlinear term q^2, in the Hamiltonian describing the system where q is the position of the mechanical oscillator. In the rest of the work we will refer to this as mechanical nonlinearity. All the higher order nonlinear terms are neglected, as we assume weak coupling between the mechanical oscillator and the qubit. First, by rigorously deriving the stability condition of the optomechanical system, we show that the nonlinearity affects the system stability. Then we focus on the steady-state optomechanical entanglement between the cavity filed and the mechanical mirror. We find that the bipartite entanglement between the cavity filed and the mechanical mirror can be significantly optimized via the mechanical nonlinearity. However, we also report that unlike enhancement in optomechanical entanglement, this nonlinearity does not help improving cavity cooling of the

* aksarma@iitg.ernet.in

mechanical mirror, over the conventional optomechanical system.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows: In Sec. II, we introduce the optomechanical system, where the movable mirror is coupled to a single qubit and derive the dynamics of the quantum fluctuations. In Sec. III, we study the steady-state optomechanical entanglement and discuss the robustness of our scheme against the variation of system parameters and thermal phonon fluctuations. Also, we comment on the cavity cooling of the mechanical mirror in presence of the mechanical nonlinearity, followed by conclusions in Sec. Iv.

II. SYSTEM DYNAMICS

We consider an optomechanical system (Fig. 1) in which the mechanical mirror is coupled to an auxiliary qubit.



FIG. 1. (Color online) Schematic diagram of the cavity optomechanical system

The movable end mirror has an oscillation frequency ω_m and mechanical damping rate γ_m. The cavity is driven by an intense pump laser of frequency ω_l, which couples the mechanical mirror to the cavity field via radiation pressure. With these considerations, the complete Hamiltonian of the optomechanical system in rotating frame of the laser reads ($\hbar = 1$) as follows:

$$H = H_c + H_m + H_{mc} + H_{mq}, \tag{1}$$

$$H_c = \Delta_0 a^\dagger a + E_0(a + a^\dagger), \tag{2}$$

$$H_m = \frac{\omega_m}{2}(p^2 + q^2), \tag{3}$$

$$H_{mc} = -g a^\dagger a q, \tag{4}$$

$$H_{mq} = -\frac{\eta}{2} q^2. \tag{5}$$

Here, a and $a^\dagger$ ($[a, a^\dagger] = 1$) are the annihilation and creation operators of the cavity field respectively. The cavity field has a resonance frequency ω_c and decays at rate κ. q and p ($[q, p] = 1$) are the dimensionless position and momentum of the mechanical mirror, respectively. In Eq. (1) H_c represents the Hamiltonian of the driven cavity with cavity detuning $\Delta_0 = \omega_c - \omega_l$ and driving amplitude E_0. H_m describes the free mirror Hamiltonian. H_{mc} refers to the mirror cavity interaction with optomechanical coupling strength g. Finally, the last term in Eq. (1) describes the coupling between the mechanical oscillator and the ancilla system, here a single qubit, results in a mechanical nonlinearity that is quadratic in position of the oscillator.

In addition to this the system dynamics also include fluctuation-dissipation processes affecting both the cavity field and mechanical mirror. Starting from Hamiltonian (1), the time evolution of the system is given by nonlinear Langevin equations:

$$\dot{q} = \omega_m p, \tag{6a}$$

$$\dot{p} = -\omega_m q + \eta q - \gamma_m p + g a^\dagger a + \xi, \tag{6b}$$

$$\dot{a} = -(\kappa + i\Delta_0)a + igaq - iE_0 + \sqrt{2\kappa}a_{in}. \tag{6c}$$

Here, a_{in} is the vacuum input noise operator with zero mean value and nonzero correlation function given by [53]:

$$\langle a_{in}(t) a_{in}^\dagger(t')\rangle = \delta(t - t'). \tag{7}$$

On the other hand ξ is the stochastic Hermitian Brownian noise operator, with the non-Markovian correlation function [55], given by:

$$\langle \xi(t)\xi(t')\rangle = \frac{\gamma_m}{\omega_m}\int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{-i\omega(t-t')}\omega \left[\coth\left(\frac{\hbar\omega}{2K_B T}\right) + 1\right], \tag{8}$$

where K_B is the Boltzmann constant and T is the mirror temperature. However, in the limit of high mechanical quality factor $Q = \omega_m/\gamma_m \gg 1$, this mirror Brownian noise $\xi(t)$ could be well approximated as a Markovian one, with the asymptotic form of the correlation function, given by [55]:

$$\langle \xi(t)\xi(t') + \xi(t')\xi(t)\rangle = \gamma_m (2n_{th} + 1)\,\delta(t - t'), \tag{9}$$

where $n_{th} = \left[\exp\left(\frac{\hbar\omega_m}{K_B T}\right) - 1\right]^{-1}$ is the mean thermal phonon number.

Under intense laser driving, we now rewrite each Heisenberg operators as a c-number steady-state value plus an additional small fluctuation operator with zero mean value: $a = a_s + \delta a$, $q = q_s + \delta q$, $p = p_s + \delta p$. The steady-state values are then calculated by solving the following nonlinear algebraic equations:

$$p_s = 0, \tag{10a}$$

$$-\omega_m q_s + \eta q_s + g|a_s|^2 = 0, \tag{10b}$$

$$a_s = -(\kappa + i\Delta)a_s - iE_0 = 0, \tag{10c}$$

where $\Delta = \Delta_0 - g q_s$ is the effective cavity detuning, modified owing to radiation pressure interaction. As for the fluctuations, their dynamics is linearized in the limit $a_s \gg 1$ and given by:

$$\dot{\delta}q = \omega_m \delta p, \tag{11a}$$

$$\dot{\delta}p = -(\omega_m - \eta)\,\delta q - \gamma_m \delta p + \frac{G}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\delta a + \delta a^\dagger\right) + \xi, \tag{11b}$$

$$\dot{\delta}a = -(\kappa + i\Delta)\delta a + i\frac{G}{\sqrt{2}}\delta q + \sqrt{2\kappa}a_{in}, \tag{11c}$$



FIG. 2. (Color online) Stable and unstable region of the optomechanical system in the $(G/\omega_m, \Delta/\omega_m)$ plane, respectively for (a) $\eta = 0$ and (b) $\eta = 0.6\omega_m$. The green and the Blue region respectively corresponds to the stable and unstable phase of the optomechanical system. The other parameters are chosen to be $\omega_m/(2\pi) = 10$ MHz, $Q = 10^5$, $\kappa/(2\pi) = 5$ MHz, $T_0 = 0.6$ K.

where a_s is considered to be real and $G = g_0 a_s\sqrt{2}$ is the effective optomechanical coupling strength.

Next, we introduce the quadrature operators for the cavity field as follows: $\delta X = \left(\delta a + \delta a^\dagger\right)\sqrt{2}$ and $\delta Y = \left(\delta a - a^\dagger\right) i\sqrt{2}$. The corresponding Hermitian input noise operators are: $\delta X_{in} = \left(\delta a_{in} + \delta a_{in}^\dagger\right)\sqrt{2}$ and $\delta Y_{in} = \left(\delta a_{in} - a_{in}^\dagger\right) i\sqrt{2}$. Using these, we express Eq. (11) in a compact form as follows:

$$\dot{u}(t) = Au(t) + n(t), \tag{12}$$

where $u^T(t) = (\delta q, \delta p, \delta X, \delta Y)$ is the vector of continuous variable (CV) quadrature fluctuations, A is the drift matrix:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega_m & 0 & 0 \\ -(\omega_m - \eta) & -\gamma_m & G & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\kappa & \Delta \\ 0 & 0 & -\Delta & -\kappa \end{pmatrix}, \tag{13}$$

and $n^T(t) = \left(0, \xi, \sqrt{2\kappa}X_{in}, \sqrt{2\kappa}Y_{in}\right)$ is the vector of noise sources. The solution of Eq. (11) reaches its steady state when all the eigen values of the drift matrix A have negative real parts. This stability condition is checked via Routh-Hurwitz criteria [56], which is given in terms of the system parameters, by the following two nontrivial equations:

$$2\gamma_m[\Delta^4 + \Delta^2(\gamma_m^2 + 2\gamma_m\kappa + 2\kappa^2 - 2\omega_m^2) + (\gamma_m\kappa + \kappa^2 + \omega_m^2)^2] + G^2\Delta\omega_m(\gamma_m + 2\kappa)^2 + 4\eta\gamma_m\kappa\omega_m(\Delta^2 - \gamma_m\kappa - \kappa^2 - \omega_m^2) + 2\eta^2\omega_m^2\gamma_m\kappa > 0, \tag{14a}$$

$$\left(\Delta^2 + \kappa^2\right)\omega_m^2 - \eta\left(\Delta^2 + \kappa^2\right)\omega_m - G^2\Delta\omega_m > 0. \tag{14b}$$

In fact, Eq. (14b) could be further simplified to:

$$G < G_{thres} = \sqrt{(\Delta^2 + \kappa^2)(\omega_m - \eta)/\Delta}, \tag{15}$$

where G_{thres} is the threshold optomechanical coupling strength, separating the stable and unstable phase of the system. We note that in contrast to standard optomechanical system [7], now the system's stability depends on the mechanical nonlinearity and one must have $\eta < \omega_m$. To numerically illustrate our result, we consider a set of experimentally feasible parameters [10,60,61]. Fig. (2a) and (2b) depict the stable (green) and the unstable (blue) phase of the optomechanical system in the $(G/\omega_m, \Delta/\omega_m)$ plane, respectively without $(\eta = 0)$ and with $(\eta = 0.6\omega_m)$ mechanical nonlinearity. It is clear that in the former case the stability range is much wider than the later. The system is stable from $G/\omega_m = 0$ to $G/\omega_m = 0.9$ without mechanical nonlinearity (Fig. (2a)). On the other hand, with nonlinear amplitude $\eta = 0.6\omega_m$ (Fig. (2b)) the stability region stretches from $G/\omega_m = 0.0$ to $G/\omega_m = 0.63$. Therefore, the mechanical nonlinearity imposes a serious limitation on the maximum allowable effective optomechanical coupling strength. In the remainder of the paper, to operate safely within the stability range of the system, we will restrict ourselves to $G \leq 0.6\omega_m$.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Since the dynamics is linearized and the quantum noises a_{in} and ξ are zero-mean Gaussian noises, the steady state for the fluctuations are zero-mean bipartite Gaussian state, which is fully characterised by its 4×4 covariance matrix (CM):

$$V_{ij} = \left(\langle u_i(\infty)u_j(\infty) + u_j(\infty)u_i(\infty)\rangle\right)/2, \tag{16}$$

where $u^T(\infty) = (\delta q(\infty), \delta p(\infty), \delta X(\infty), \delta Y(\infty))$ is the vector of continuous variable fluctuation operators in the steady-state $(t \to \infty)$. When the system is stable, the steady-state CM satisfies the following Lyapunov equation [7]:

$$AV^T + VA^T + D = 0, \tag{17}$$



FIG. 3. (Color online) Plot of logarithmic negativity E_N as a function of (a) normalized detuning Δ/ω_m for a fixed coupling strength $G = 0.6\omega_m$ and (b) dimensionless effective optomechanical coupling strength G/ω_m at a fixed detuning $\Delta = 0.5\omega_m$, with all the other parameters same as in Fig. (2).

where D is the diffusion matrix (the matrix of noise correlation), given by:

$$D = \text{Diag}\left[o, \gamma_m(2n_{th}+1), \kappa, \kappa\right]. \tag{18}$$

Now, to study the optomechanical entanglement we express V as follows:

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} V_m & V_{mc} \\ V_{mc}^T & V_c \end{pmatrix}, \tag{19}$$

where V_m, V_c and V_{mc} , are 2×2 block matrices, corresponds to the mechanical mirror, the cavity field and the optomechanical correlation between mirror and field, respectively. Then the degree of quantum entanglement between the mechanical mirror and cavity field can be assessed by calculating the so-called logarithmic negativity [57,58], defined as:

$$E_N = \max\left[0, -\ln 2\nu^-\right], \tag{20}$$

where $\nu^- = 2^{-1/2}\left[\sum(V) - \sqrt{\sum(V)^2 - 4\text{det}V}\right]^{1/2}$ is the lowest sympletic eigenvalue of the partial transpose of V with $\sum(V) = \text{det}V_m + \text{det}V_c - \text{det}V_{mc}$. Therefore, the Gaussian state is entangled if and only if $\nu^- < 1/2$ (Simon's necessary and sufficient criteraia [59]), which is equivalent to the inequality $4\text{det}V < \sum(V) - 1/4$.

In Fig. 3(a), we plot logarithmic negativity E_N versus normalized detuning Δ/ω_m, for different nonlinear amplitudes. It shows that for the chosen parameters, the linear system ($\eta = 0$) exhibits optomechanical entanglement, which reaches its maximum $E_n^{max} = 0.18$ around $\Delta = 0.8\omega_m$. However, introduction of mechanical nonlinearity enhances the degree of entanglement and shifts the position of maxima towards lower detuning. In particular, a high degree of entanglement $E_n^{max} = 0.34$ is achieved near $\Delta = 0.51\omega_m$ for $\eta = 0.6\omega_m$. Here, it is worth mentioning that with the chosen parameters, $(\Delta/\omega_m, \eta/\omega_m = 0.80, 0.0)$ and $(\Delta/\omega_m, \eta/\omega_m = 0.51, 0.6)$ respectively yield: $G_{thres} = 1.03\omega_m$ and $G_{thres} = 0.63\omega_m$. This implies that the maximal entanglement appears when $G \to G_{thres}$ i.e. for the maximum possible optomechanical coupling strength. Therefore, we infer that this entanglement enhancement is achieved due to the softening nature of the mechanical nonlinearity, which brings the system close to its instability threshold. Fig. 3(b) depicts logarithmic negativity E_N as a function of the dimensionless effective optomechanical coupling strength G/ω_m, for different nonlinear amplitudes. As expected after a critical coupling strength (G_c) , entanglement appears and increases with increasing coupling strength. We also find that for a fixed coupling strength, increase in nonlinear amplitude enhances the degree of entanglement. However, a more interesting situation is depicted in the inset of Fig. 3(b). It shows that with increase in nonlinear amplitude the critical coupling strength required to attain optomechanical entanglement is lowered. For example, the linear system ($\eta = 0$) exhibits entanglement at $G_c = 0.24\omega_m$, whereas, in presence of mechanical nonlinearity ($\eta = 0.6\omega_m$) it shows entanglement at $G_c = 0.18\omega_m$. Hence, the mechanical nonlinearity not only enhances the degree of optomechanical entanglement but also generates it at a considerably lower coupling strength.

Next, to study the robustness of our scheme, we plot in Fig. (4) logarithmic negativity E_N as a function of normalized detuning Δ/ω_m and the mirror's environmental temperature T, for various nonlinear amplitudes. We observe that the degree of entanglement decreases monotonically with increasing temperature. However, the maximum temperature up to which entanglement persists increases with increasing nonlinear amplitudes. For example, in the linear case ($\eta = 0$) the entanglement is maintained up to the temperature $T = 3.18$ K ($n_{th} = 6626$,



FIG. 4. (Color online) Plot of logarithmic negativity E_N as a function of normalized detuning Δ/ω_m and mirror's environmental temperature T, respectively for (a) $\eta = 0$, (b) $\eta = 0.2\omega_m$, (c) $\eta = 0.4\omega_m$, and (d) $\eta = 0.6\omega_m$. Here, the effective optomechanical coupling strength is set to $G = 0.6\omega_m$, with all the other parameters same as in Fig. (2).

the corresponding number of thermal phonons). In contrast, in presence of a nonlinearity $\eta = 0.6\omega_m$ the entanglement persists up to $T = 5.64$ K ($n_{th} = 11752$). Thus, the bipartite entanglement in presence of the mechanical nonlinearity becomes more robust against thermal phonon fluctuations.

In passing, as the same cavity optomechanical system serves as a great tool for cooling the mechanical mirror close to its quantum ground state, it may be useful to investigate the role of mechanical nonlinearity on it. In general, when a light scatters from an oscillating mirror, it generates Stokes and anti-Stokes sidebands. The generation of anti-Stoke field results in absorption of a vibrational phonon leading to cooling of the mechanical mirror. On the other hand, the Stokes field heats the mirror by generating an extra phonon. When the cavity field is resonant with the anti-Stoke sideband ($\Delta = \omega_m$), cooling occurs and results with effective mean phonon number $n_{eff} < 1$.

For the given optomechanical system, we can easily calculate the effective mean phonon number, n_{eff}, from the steady-state covariance matrix as follows:

$$n_{eff} = (V_{11} + V_{22} - 1)/2, \tag{21}$$

Fig. (5) depicts the effective mean phonon number n_{eff} as a function of normalized detuning Δ/ω_m and dimensionless effective optomechanical coupling strength G/ω_m, for increasing nonlinear amplitudes. We observe that, with the same set of parameters, a considerable amount of ground state cooling is achieved ($n_{eff} < 1$), simultaneously with optomechanical entanglement.However, the minimum effective mean phonon number increases with increase in the nonlinear amplitude. For the linear system ($\eta = 0$) an optimal cooling $n_{eff}^{min} = 0.19$ ($T = 0.26$mK) is achieved around $\Delta \cong \omega_m$, whereas in presence of nonlinearity $\eta = 0.6\omega_m$ one gets $n_{eff}^{min} = 0.53$ ($T = 0.47$mK). We also note that, unlike the optomechanical entanglement, now the parameter region of achieving optimal cooling is shifted towards lower coupling strength G/ω_m i.e. quite far from the instability threshold. Hence, entanglement is not optimal when cooling is optimal. In fact, a similar inference is made by Vitali *et al.*[9] also. Nevertheless, the proposed scheme for achieving bipartite entanglement is expected to provide practical and robust solutions for continuous-variable quantum-communication protocols.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we have studied steady-state optomechanical entanglement in an optomechanical system, in which the mechanical mirror is coupled to an auxiliary qubit. First, by employing the Routh-Hurwitz criteria, we observed a reduction in the stability range of the optomechanical system. This enables us to choose the maximum allowable optomechanical coupling strength judiciously. Then we focused on the steady-state optomechanical entanglement and found that the introduction of the mechanical nonlinearity generates an enhanced and



FIG. 5. (Color online) Plot of effective mean phonon number n_{eff} as a function of normalized detuning Δ/ω_m and mirror's environmental temperature T, respectively for (a) $\eta = 0$, (b) $\eta = 0.2\omega_m$, (c) $\eta = 0.4\omega_m$, and (d) $\eta = 0.6\omega_m$. The operating parameters are same as in Fig. (2).

robust entanglement at a considerably lower coupling strength. Thus our scheme offers considerable advantages, for generating steady-state optomechanical entanglement, over the conventional systems. The proposed scheme may find its applications in realizing continuous-variable quantum information interfaces and networks.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

S. Chakraborty would like to acknowledge the financial support from MHRD, Government of India.

[1] A. Schliesser, P. Del'Haye, N. Nooshi, K. J. Vahala, and T. J. Kippenberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 243905 (2006).
[2] I. Wilson-Rae, N. Nooshi, W. Zwerger, and T. J. Kippenberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 0933901 (2007).
[3] F. Marquardt, J. P. Chen, A. A. Clerk, and S. M. Grivin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 0933902 (2007).
[4] C. Genes, D. Vitali, P. Tombesi, S. Gigan, and M. A. Aspelmeyer, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 033804 (2008); B. Sarma and A.K. Sarma, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 033845 (2016).
[5] J. D. Teufel, T. Donner, D. Li, J. H. Harlow, M. S. Allman, K. Cicak, A. J. Sirios, J. D. Whittaker, K. W. Lehnert, and R. W. Simmonds, Nature (London) **475**, 359 (2011).
[6] J. Chan, T. P. Mayer Alegre, A. H. Safavi-Naeini, J. T. Hill, A. Krause, S. Groblacher, M. Aspelmeyer, and O. Painter, Nature **478**, 89 (2011).
[7] D. Vitali, S. Gigan, A. Ferreira, H. R. Böhm, P. Tombesi, A. Guerreiro, V. Vedral, A. Zeilinger, and M. A. Aspelmeyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 030405 (2007); S.G. Hofer and K. Hammerer,Phys. Rev. A **91**, 033822 (2015);Z. Jiao Deng, X-B Yan, Y-D Wang, and C-W Wu,Phys. Rev. A **93**, 033842 (2016);K. Sinha, S-Y Lin, and B. L. Hu,Phys. Rev. A **92**, 023852 (2015).
[8] M. Paternostro, D. Vitali, S. Gigan, M. S. Kim, C. Brukner, J. Eisert, and M. A. Aspelmeyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 250401 (2007); Y. He, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 013827 (2015); Y-D Wang, S. Chesi, and A. A. Clerk,Phys. Rev. A **91**, 013807 (2015)
[9] C. Genes, A. Mari, P. Tombesi, and D. Vitali, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 032316 (2008).
[10] C. Genes, D. Vitali, and P. Tombesi, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 050307(R) (2008).
[11] B. Rogers, M. paternostro, G. M. Palma, and G. D. Chiara, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 042323 (2012).
[12] L. Tian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 233602 (2013).
[13] W. Nie, A. Chen, Y. Lan, Q. LIao, and S. Zhu, New. J. Phys. **49**, 025501 (2015).
[14] S. Mancini and P. Tombesi, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 4055 (1994).
[15] H. Ian, Z. R. Gong, Y. X. Liu, C. P. Sun, and F. Noori, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 013824 (2008).

[16] K. Jähne, C. Genes, K. Hammeres, M. Wallquist, E. S. Polzik, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 063819 (2009).

[17] A. A. Clerk, F. Marquardt, and K. Jacobs, New. J. Phys. **10**, 095010 (2008).

[18] H. Tan, G. LI, and P. Meystre, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 033829 (2013).

[19] E. G. Dalla Toree, J. Otterbach, E. Delmer, V. Vuletic, and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 120402 (2013).

[20] D. W. C. Brooks, T. Botter, S. Schreppler, T. P. Purdy, N. B. Brahms, and D. M. Stamper-Kurn, Nature, (London) **488**, 476 (2012).

[21] X. X. Ren, H. K. LI, M. Y. Yan, Y. C. Liu, Y. F. Xiao, and Q. H. Gong, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 033807 (2013).

[22] P. Rabl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 063601 (2011).

[23] S. Rips, M. Kiffner, I. Wilson-Rae, and M. J. Hartmann, New. J. Phys. **14**, 023042 (2012).

[24] U. Akram, W. P. Bowen, and G. J. Milburn, New. J. Phys. **15**, 0993007 (2013).

[25] J. Zhang, K. Peng, and Samuel L. Braunstein, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 013808 (2003).

[26] S. Sing, H. Jing, E. M. Wright, and P. Meystre, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 021801(R) (2012).

[27] L. Tian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 153604 (2012).

[28] L. Tian and H. L. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 053806 (2010).

[29] T. A. Palomaki, J. W. Harlow, J. D. Teufel, R. W. Simmonds, and K. W. Lehnert, Nature (London) **495**, 210 (2013).

[30] S. Mancicni, D. Vitali, and P. Tombesi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 137901 (2003).

[31] S. Rips and M. J. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. lett. **111**, 120503 (2013).

[32] K. Stannigel, P. Komar, S. J. M. Harbraken, S. D. Bennett, M. D. Lukin, P. Zoller, and P. Rabl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 013603 (2012).

[33] C. A. Regal, J. D. Teufel, and K. W. Lehnert, Nat. Phys. **4**, 555 (2008).

[34] A. G. Krause, M. Wigner, T. D. Blasius, Q. Lin, and O. Painter, Nat. Photon. **6**, 768 (2012).

[35] J. D. Teufel, T. Donner, M. A. Castellanos-Beltran, J. W. Harlow, and K. W. Lehnert, Nat. Nanotechnol. **4**, 820 (2009).

[36] A. Arvanitaki and A. A. Geraci, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 071105 (2013).

[37] L. S. Collaboration *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **7**, 962 (2011).

[38] M. A. Taylor, J. Janousek, V. Daria, J. Knittel, B. Hage, H.-A. Bachor, and W. P. Bowen, Nat. Photon. **7** 229, (2013).

[39] P. Ehrenfest, Z. Phys. A **45**, 455 (1927).

[40] A. N. Cleland, *Foundation of Nanomechanics From Solid-state Theory to Device Applicationa* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2003).

[41] Z. L. Xiang, S. Ashhab, J. Q. You, and F. Noorim Rev. Mod. Phys. **85**, (2013).

[42] L. Tian, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 035417 (2011).

[43] A. D. O'Connel, M. Hofheinz, M. Ansmann, R.C. Bialazak, M. Lenander, E. Lucero, M. Neeley, D. Sank, H. Wang, M. Wides, J. Wenner, J. M. Martinis, and A. N. Cleland, Nature (London) **464**, 697 (2010).

[44] K. Jacobs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 117203 (2007).

[45] A. D. Armour, M. P. Blencowe, and K.C. Schwab, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 148301 (2002).

[46] S. Rips, I. Wilson-Rae, and M. J. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. A. **89**, 013854 (2014).

[47] P. Djorwé, S. G. Nana Engo, and P. Wofao, Phys. Rev. A **90** 024303 (2014).

[48] K. Jacobs and A. J. Landahl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 067201 (2009).

[49] X. Y. Lü, J. Q. Liao, L. Tian, and F. Noori, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 013834 (2015).

[50] D.-Y. Wang, C.-H, Bei, H.-F. Wang, A.-D. Zhu, and S. Zhang, Sci. Rep. **6**, 24421 (2016).

[51] K. Jacobs, L. Tian, and J. Finn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 057208 (2009).

[52] C. K. Law, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 2537 (1995).

[53] D. F. Walls and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum Optics* (Springer, Berlin, 1994).

[54] V. Giovannetti and D. Vitali, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 023812 (2001).

[55] R. Benguria and M. Kac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46**, 1 (1981).

[56] E. X. DeJesus and C. Kaufman, Phys. Rev. A **35**, 5288 (1987).

[57] G. Vidal and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 0323214 (2002).

[58] G. Adesso, A. Serafini, and F. Illuminati, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 022318 (2004).

[59] R. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2726 (2000).

[60] S. Gigan, H. R. Böhm, M. Paternostro, F. Blaser, G. Langer, J. B. Hertzberg, K. C. Schwab, D. Bäuerle, M. Aspelmeyer, and A. Zeilinger, Nature (London) **444**, 67 (2006).

[61] O. Arcizet, P.-F. Cohadon, T. Briant, M. Pinard, and A. Heidmann, Nature (London) **444**, 71 (2006).